

Is the event study methodology useful for merger analysis? A comparison of stock market and accounting data

Duso, Tomaso; Gugler, Klaus; Yurtoglu, B. Burcin

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Duso, T., Gugler, . K., & Yurtoglu, B. B. (2006). *Is the event study methodology useful for merger analysis? A comparison of stock market and accounting data.* (Discussion Papers / Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Forschungsschwerpunkt Märkte und Politik, Abteilung Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und industrieller Wandel, 2006-19). Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-193094>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Tomaso Duso *
Klaus Gugler **
Burçin Yurtoglu **

**Is the Event Study Methodology
Useful for Merger Analysis?
A Comparison of Stock Market and Accounting Data**

* Humboldt University Berlin and WZB-
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
** University of Vienna

SP II 2006 – 19

September 2006

ISSN Nr. 0722 – 6748

**Research Area
Markets and Politics**

**Research Unit
Competitiveness and Industrial Change**

**Schwerpunkt II
Märkte und Politik**

**Abteilung
Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und industrieller Wandel**

Zitierweise/Citation:

Tomaso Duso, Klaus Gugler, and Burçin Yurtoglu, **Is the Event Study Methodology Useful for Merger Analysis? A Comparison of Stock Market and Accounting Data**, Discussion Paper SP II 2006 – 19, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, 2006.

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH,
Reichpietschufer 50, 10785 Berlin, Germany, Tel. (030) 2 54 91 – 0
Internet: www.wz-berlin.de

ABSTRACT

Is the Event Study Methodology Useful for Merger Analysis? A Comparison of Stock Market and Accounting Data*

by Tomaso Duso, Klaus Gugler, and Burçin Yurtoglu

We use a sample of 167 mergers during the period 1990-2002 involving 544 firms either as merging firms or competitors. We contrast a measure of the merger's profitability based on event studies with one based on accounting data. We find positive and significant correlations between them when using a long window around the announcement date.

Keywords: Mergers, Merger Control, Event Studies, Ex-post Evaluation

JEL Classification: L4, K21, G34

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Ist die "event study" Methodologie nützlich für die Analyse von Fusionen? Ein Vergleich von Aktienmärkte und Bilanzdaten

Wir analysieren eine Stichprobe von 167 Fusionen, die zwischen 1990 und 2002 stattgefunden haben und welche 544 Unternehmen –entweder als fusionierende Parteien oder als Wettbewerber– involviert haben. Wir vergleichen eine auf "event studies" basierende Rentabilitätsmaß der Fusion zu einer alternativen Maß, die durch Bilanzdaten konstruiert wurde. Wir finden, dass diese zwei maße positiv und signifikant korrelieren besonders wenn wir ein langes Fenster um die Fusionsankündigung in dem "event study" benutzen.

*

Acknowledgments: T. Duso gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft through SFB/TR 15. K. Gugler and B. B. Yurtoglu acknowledge financial support from the OeNB through project 11782.

Corresponding author: Tomaso Duso, Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), Reichpietschufer 50, D-10785 Berlin, Germany. Tel: +49 30 25491 403, Fax: +49 30 25491 444, E-Mail: duso@wz-berlin.de.

1. Introduction

The assessment of the competitive effects of large mergers is one of the most important tasks for anti-trust authorities worldwide. Unfortunately, these effects are not observed at the time when the authority must make its decision to allow or block the merger or let the merger through with remedies. In principle, stock markets could help predicting the future profitability, since they are forward looking. However, many economists, in particular industrial organization economists, are skeptical about the markets' ability to correctly anticipate mergers' competitive effects. Thus, the pioneering efforts of Eckbo (1983) have not been widely applied in merger analysis.

This paper tries to close the gap between the finance and industrial organization literatures by estimating (1) (ex ante) announcement effects of mergers on both merging and rival firms, (2) (ex post) balance sheet profit effects of these mergers on merging and rival firms up to five years post-mergers, and (3) comparing these estimates by correlation analysis.

2. Measuring Profitability

2.1. Event Studies

Under the assumptions of efficient markets and rational expectations, the market model predicts that firm i 's stock return at time t (R_{it}) is proportional to a market return ($R_{it} = \alpha + \beta R_{mt} + \varepsilon_{it}$). We estimate the market model over 240 trading days, starting 50 days prior to the announcement day. We use the estimated values for the model's parameters to predict what firm i 's stock price would have been, had the merger not been announced (\hat{R}_{it}). For firm i , we then calculate the abnormal return around the mergers' announcement day t (AR_{it}) as: $AR_{it} = R_{it} - \hat{R}_{it} = R_{it} - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} R_{mt})$. The cumulative abnormal return (CAR) over an event window (m, n) is then defined to be:

$CAR_{i,m,n} = \sum_{\tau=-m}^{\tau=n} AR_{i,\tau}$. We calculate these measures for each of the merging rival firms.¹

2.2. Ex-post Profitability

We use the methodology of Gugler et al. (2003) to predict the merger's ex post profit effects. The method compares reported profit levels post merger with predicted profit levels in the *absence* of the merger. Our counterfactual is the development of profits and total assets of the median firm (in terms of profitability) in the same 3-digit industry as the merging firms or their rivals operate. We used a number of other counterfactuals, such as similar size or geographical regions but none changed our results significantly.

¹ See Duso, Gugler, and Yurtoglu (2006) for a description of the literature, the data, and a more complete description of the methodology.

The projected change in the returns on the acquirer's assets from year $t-1$ to $t+n$ are defined as:

$$\Delta_{IG,t-1,t+n} = \frac{\Pi_{IG,t+n}}{K_{IG,t+n}} - \frac{\Pi_{IG,t-1}}{K_{IG,t-1}}, \text{ where } \Pi_{IG,t+n} \text{ are the median firm's (income statement) profits and } K_{IG,t+n}$$

are the median firm's assets both in the same 3-digit industry of the acquired company in year $t+n$. We define $\Delta_{ID,t,t+n}$ for the acquired firm's industry analogously to $\Delta_{IG,t-1,t+n}$. The predicted profits of the combined company M in year $t+n$ is then:

$$\Pi_{Mt+n}^{predicted} = \Pi_{G,t-1} + \frac{K_{IG,t+n}}{K_{IG,t-1}} K_{G,t-1} \Delta_{IG,t-1,t+n} + \Pi_{Dt} + \frac{K_{ID,t+n}}{K_{ID,t}} K_{Dt} \Delta_{ID,t,t+n},$$

where $\Pi_{G,t+n}$ (Π_{Dt}) are the profits and $K_{G,t+n}$ (K_{Dt}) are the assets of the acquiring (acquired) company in year $t+n$ (t).

The same logic can be applied to the rivals. In fact, antitrust markets are different than industries based on the SIC classification. The advantage of our database is that we have information on the merging firms' *effective* rivals in the involved product markets. These firms are not a good counterfactual, since they are influenced by the merger just as much as the merging firms are. However, the merger should not strongly affect the rest of the industry, which makes the 3-digit SIC classification a good counterfactual for the merger, once we exclude the merging and rivals firms. We can, hence, get a measure of the projected change in the returns and of the predicted profit for the rivals in absence of the merger, which is something novel in the literature.

Our measure of firm i 's merger effect (i =merging entity or rivals) is then the difference between actual (observed) profits in year $t+n$ and the predicted profits: $\Delta\Pi_{it+n}^{effect} = \Delta\Pi_{it+n}^{actual} - \Delta\Pi_{it+n}^{predicted}$

3. The Data and Correlations

Our sample consists of 167 concentrations that were analyzed by the European Commission (EC) during the period 1990-2002.² We identify 544 different firms either as merging or as rival firms. The relevant markets and, thus, rivals are defined in the EC reports.

Table 1 reports the median values for the CARs based on different event windows and the profitability effects ($\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$) for merging firms and rivals up to five years after the merger. In the full sample, all median values (with the possible exception for CAR (2,2) for rivals, which is close to zero) have the same sign.

Table 2 reports pairwise correlations among CARs and profitability effects. For merging firms, the correlation coefficients between CAR (50, 5) and firms' profit are always positive and mostly significant. The profit effects four years after the merger seem to be very well captured by all

² Our sample includes almost all phase II mergers completed by the EU by the end of 2001, and a randomly matched sample of phase I cases, which run up to June 2002. See Duso, Neven, and Röller (2006).

measures of abnormal returns. However, CARs based on long windows seem to perform better. The picture is different for rivals: CARs based on short windows produce very misleading results, since they are *negatively* and significantly correlated to the real profit effects. However, for rivals the CARs based on long windows (30 or 55 days) also seem to capture very well the long term merger's profit effects.

Table 3 splits the sample into pro and anticompetitive mergers.³ Interestingly, the market correctly anticipates anti-competitive mergers when using long pre-announcement periods (25 to 50 days), as witnessed by the large and significant correlation coefficients for rivals up to five years post merger. Also, the market predicts merging firms' rents stemming from increased efficiencies (procompetitive mergers) more precisely than those stemming from an increase in market power (anticompetitive mergers).

4. Conclusions

This paper establishes empirical evidence that the event study methodology is useful for the competitive analysis of mergers. In particular, for a large sample of EU mergers during the period 1990-2002, we show that abnormal returns and ex post profitability of mergers are positively and significantly correlated. This is particularly true when using long event windows and, for rivals, in anti-competitive mergers.

References

- Duso T., D. Neven, and L.-H. Röller (2006), "The political economy of European Merger Control," *The Journal of Law and Economics*, forthcoming.
- Duso, T., K. Gugler, and B. Yurtoglu, (2006), "EU merger remedies: An empirical assessment", in J. Stennek and V. Goshal Eds., *The Political Economy of Antitrust*, North Holland, forthcoming.
- Eckbo, B. E., (1983), "Horizontal mergers, collusion, and stockholder wealth", *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11, 241-273.
- Gugler, K. D.C. Mueller, B. B. Yurtoglu, and C. Zulehner, (2003), "The effects of mergers: An international comparison", *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 21, 5, 625-653.

³ The argument follows Eckbo (1983). We define a merger to be anticompetitive if the aggregated CAR of rivals (i.e. the weighted sum of the CARs of all rivals for each merger) in the (25,5) window is positive. See Duso, Neven, and Röller (2006) for a formal derivation of the correspondence between increase in rivals' profit and decrease in consumers' surplus.

Table 1: Preliminary Statistics

	MERGING FIRMS							
	CAR(2,2)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)	$\Delta\Pi_{M,t+1}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{M,t+2}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{M,t+3}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{M,t+4}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{M,t+5}^{effect}$
Median	9.229	2.359	29.742	62.260	103.521	108.986	203.217	202.620
Obs.	125	126	127	131	132	101	86	66
	RIVALS							
	CAR(2,2)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)	$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$	$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$
Median	-0.571	5.666	4.528	69.256	53.328	74.230	103.467	242.653
Obs.	314	313	311	321	327	221	174	143

Notes: All values are expressed in Million US\$. The $CAR(m,n)$ variables represent the cumulative abnormal returns over the window spanning from m days before the event to n days after the event. The $\Delta\Pi_{i,t+n}^{effect}$ variables represent the aggregated profit change from one year before the merger to n years after the merger if compared to the median firm in the same SIC3 industry.

Table 2: Pairwise Correlations: all mergers

	MERGING FIRMS					RIVALS				
	CAR(1,1)	CAR(2,2)	CAR(5,5)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)	CAR(1,1)	CAR(2,2)	CAR(5,5)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+1}^{effect}$	-0.1069	0.0144	-0.0357	0.1274	0.1643	-0.1752	0.0953	-0.0662	0.0690	0.1648
	0.1870	0.8598	0.6599	0.1131	0.0411**	0.0005***	0.0571**	0.1878	0.1703	0.0010***
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+2}^{effect}$	-0.0314	0.1281	-0.0537	0.1289	0.2031	-0.2045	-0.1488	-0.0752	-0.0133	0.0611
	0.7284	0.1546	0.5519	0.1488	0.0225**	0.0003***	0.0082***	0.1855	0.8150	0.2814
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+3}^{effect}$	-0.0196	0.0013	0.0210	0.2022	0.2096	-0.2487	0.0024	-0.0983	0.0856	0.0617
	0.8479	0.9900	0.8375	0.0448	0.0373**	0.0002***	0.9715	0.1462	0.2057	0.3647
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+4}^{effect}$	0.3443	0.5408	0.0966	0.1601	0.4778	-0.1521	-0.1556	-0.0462	0.1802	0.0818
	0.0013***	0.0000***	0.3848	0.1459	0.0000***	0.0464**	0.0415**	0.5474	0.0180**	0.2862
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+5}^{effect}$	0.1947	0.2882	0.1894	0.1444	0.0926	-0.2539	-0.1770	0.0615	0.4556	0.1837
	0.1201	0.0199**	0.1309	0.2511	0.4630	0.0025***	0.0364**	0.4704	0.0000***	0.0298**

Notes: We report pairwise correlation coefficients (first row) as well as p-values (second row).***, **, * represent significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively.

Table 3: Pairwise Correlations: Mergers split into pro- and anti-competitive

	MERGING FIRMS									
	PROCOMPETITIVE					ANTICOMPETITIVE				
	CAR(1,1)	CAR(2,2)	CAR(5,5)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)	CAR(1,1)	CAR(2,2)	CAR(5,5)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+1}^{effect}$	-0.1711 0.1451	0.0434 0.7135	0.0355 0.7639	0.1252 0.2810	0.1732 0.1401	0.0494 0.6638	-0.0254 0.8243	-0.1132 0.3175	0.1601 0.1560	0.1697 0.1299
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+2}^{effect}$	0.0608 0.6304	0.2716 0.0286**	0.0655 0.6040	0.1669 0.1771	0.3442 0.0050	-0.1242 0.3446	0.0042 0.9748	-0.1626 0.2145	0.1104 0.4012	0.1115 0.3925
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+3}^{effect}$	-0.0845 0.5556	-0.0331 0.8175	-0.0486 0.7350	0.2177 0.1211	0.1635 0.2517	0.1158 0.4384	0.0688 0.6461	0.1085 0.4679	0.1993 0.1793	0.2492 0.0877*
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+4}^{effect}$	0.5701 0.0000***	0.8112 0.0000***	0.2547 0.0840*	0.2667 0.0669*	0.8304 0.0000***	-0.2472 0.1461	-0.0637 0.7123	-0.0456 0.7918	0.0777 0.6526	0.0818 0.6304
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+5}^{effect}$	0.3888 0.0210**	0.3361 0.0484**	0.2278 0.1882	-0.0360 0.8374	-0.0512 0.7702	-0.2676 0.1527	0.2903 0.1197	0.1427 0.4518	0.2360 0.2094	0.1708 0.3668
	RIVALS									
	PROCOMPETITIVE					ANTICOMPETITIVE				
	CAR(1,1)	CAR(2,2)	CAR(5,5)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)	CAR(1,1)	CAR(2,2)	CAR(5,5)	CAR(25,5)	CAR(50,5)
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+1}^{effect}$	-0.2169 0.0032***	0.3314 0.0000***	0.0204 0.7842	0.0085 0.9090	0.1264 0.0899	-0.1414 0.0392	-0.1174 0.0860*	-0.1455 0.0334**	0.1444 0.0348**	0.2191 0.0013***
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+2}^{effect}$	-0.1605 0.0447**	-0.1222 0.1262	0.0271 0.7365	-0.2188 0.0059***	-0.0413 0.6077	-0.3162 0.0001***	-0.2211 0.0055***	-0.2676 0.0008***	0.3003 0.0002***	0.2045 0.0104***
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+3}^{effect}$	-0.2773 0.0027***	0.1216 0.1953	-0.1338 0.1541	0.0062 0.9478	0.0402 0.6724	-0.2000 0.0408	-0.1353 0.1687	0.0004 0.9971	0.2199 0.0242**	0.1600 0.1029
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+4}^{effect}$	-0.2204 0.0328**	-0.2841 0.0055*	-0.2379 0.0210**	-0.0742 0.4770	-0.0837 0.4227	-0.1369 0.2318	-0.0598 0.6029	0.1817 0.1113	0.4032 0.0003***	0.1853 0.1043
$\Delta\Pi_{i,t+5}^{effect}$	0.1696 0.1514	-0.0355 0.7656	0.3037 0.0090***	0.1482 0.2108	-0.0266 0.8234	-0.5945 0.0000***	-0.4058 0.0007***	-0.3331 0.0059***	0.6128 0.0000***	0.2933 0.0160**

Notes: We report pairwise correlation coefficients (first row) as well as p-values (second row).***, **, * represent significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively. A merger is defined to be anticompetitive (procompetitive) if the aggregated cumulative abnormal returns of the rivals - CAR(25,5) - are positive (negative). The sample includes all observations for which the variable $\Delta\Pi_{i,t+2}^{effect}$ was not missing.

Bücher des Schwerpunkts Märkte und Politik
Books of the Research Area Markets and Politics

Kai A. Konrad, Beate Jochimsen (Eds.)

Finanzkrise im Bundesstaat

2006, Peter Lang Verlag

Robert Nuscheler

On Competition and Regulation in Health Care Systems

2005, Peter Lang Verlag

Pablo Beramendi

Decentralization and Income Inequality

2003, Madrid: Juan March Institute

Thomas Cusack

A National Challenge at the Local Level: Citizens, Elites and Institutions in Reunified Germany

2003, Ashgate

Sebastian Kessing

Essays on Employment Protection

2003, Freie Universität Berlin

<http://www.diss.fu-berlin.de/2003/202>

Daniel Krähmer

On Learning and Information in Markets and Organizations

2003, Shaker Verlag

Tomaso Duso

The Political Economy of the Regulatory Process: An Empirical Approach

Humboldt-University Dissertation, 2002, Berlin,

<http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/duso-tomaso-2002-07-17/PDF/Duso.pdf>

Bob Hancké

Large Firms and Institutional Change. Industrial Renewal and Economic Restructuring in France

2002, Oxford University Press

Andreas Stephan

Essays on the Contribution of Public Infrastructure to Private: Production and its Political Economy

2002, dissertation.de

Peter A. Hall, David Soskice (Eds.)

Varieties of Capitalism

2001, Oxford University Press

Hans Mewis

Essays on Herd Behavior and Strategic Delegation

2001, Shaker Verlag

Andreas Moerke

Organisationslernen über Netzwerke – Die personellen Verflechtungen von Führungsgremien japanischer Aktiengesellschaften

2001, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Silke Neubauer

Multimarket Contact and Organizational Design

2001, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Lars-Hendrik Röller, Christian Wey (Eds.)

Die Soziale Marktwirtschaft in der neuen Weltwirtschaft, WZB Jahrbuch 2001

2001, edition sigma

Michael Tröge

Competition in Credit Markets: A Theoretic Analysis

2001, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Torben Iversen, Jonas Pontusson, David Soskice (Eds.)

Unions, Employers, and Central Banks

2000, Cambridge University Press

Tobias Miarka

Financial Intermediation and Deregulation: A Critical Analysis of Japanese Bank-Firm-Relationships

2000, Physica-Verlag

Rita Zobel

Beschäftigungsveränderungen und organisationales Lernen in japanischen Industriegesellschaften

2000, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

<http://dochohost.rz.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/zobel-rita-2000-06-19>

Jos Jansen

Essays on Incentives in Regulation and Innovation

2000, Tilburg University

Ralph Siebert

Innovation, Research Joint Ventures, and Multiproduct Competition

2000, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

<http://dochohost.rz.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/siebert-ralph-2000-03-23/>

Damien J. Neven, Lars-Hendrik Röller (Eds.)

The Political Economy of Industrial Policy in Europe and the Member States

2000, edition sigma

Jianping Yang

Bankbeziehungen deutscher Unternehmen: Investitionsverhalten und Risikoanalyse

2000, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Christoph Schenk

Cooperation between Competitors – Subcontracting and the Influence of Information, Production and Capacity on Market Structure and Competition

1999, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

<http://dochohost.rz.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/schenk-christoph-1999-11-16>

Horst Albach, Ulrike Görtzen, Rita Zobel (Eds.)
**Information Processing as a Competitive
Advantage of Japanese Firms**
1999, edition sigma

Dieter Köster
Wettbewerb in Netzproduktmärkten
1999, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

DISCUSSION PAPERS 2005

Lutz Engelhardt	Geschäftsmodelle und nationale Institutionen: Ein Vergleich britischer und deutscher Neuemissionen aus der IT-Service – und Softwareindustrie 1996 – 2002	SP II 2005 – 01
Philipp Rehm	Citizen Support for the Welfare State: Determinants of Preferences for Income Redistribution	SP II 2005 – 02
Sigurt Vitols Lutz Engelhardt	National Institutions and High Tech Industries: A Varieties of Capitalism Perspective on the Failure of Germany's "Neuer Markt"	SP II 2005 – 03
Sebastian G. Kessing Kai A. Konrad	Union Strategy and Optimal Income Taxation	SP II 2005 – 04
Kai A. Konrad Amedeo Spadaro	Education, Redistributive Taxation, and Confidence	SP II 2005 – 05
Joseph A. Clougherty	The International Drivers of Domestic Airline Mergers in Twenty Nations: Integrating Industrial Organization and International Business	SP II 2005 – 06
Talat Mahmood Sara Geerdes Klaus Schömann	Unmet Labour Demand In Europe – Chances for Immigrants?	SP II 2005 – 07
Johannes Münster	Simultaneous Inter- and Intra-Group Conflicts	SP II 2005 – 08
Albert Banal-Estañol Jo Seldeslachts	Merger Failures	SP II 2005 – 09
Kai A. Konrad	Silent Interests and All-Pay Auctions	SP II 2005 – 10
Johannes Münster	Lobbying Contests with Endogenous Policy Proposals	SP II 2005 – 11
Oz Shy	Dynamic Models of Religious Conformity and Conversion: Theory and Calibration	SP II 2005 – 12
Kai A. Konrad Sergios Skaperdas	Succession Rules and Leadership Rents	SP II 2005 – 13
Kai A. Konrad Dan Kovenock	Equilibrium and Efficiency in the Tug-of-War	SP II 2005 – 14
Thomas Cusack Torben Iversen Philipp Rehm	Risks at Work: The Demand and Supply Sides of Government Redistribution	SP II 2005 – 15
Tomaso Duso Klaus Gugler Burcin Yurtoglu	EU Merger Remedies: A Preliminary Empirical Assessment	SP II 2005 – 16
Dan Kovenock Brian Roberson	Electoral Poaching and Party Identification	SP II 2005 – 17
Sebastian G. Kessing Kai A. Konrad Christos Kotsogiannis	Federal Tax Autonomy and the Limits of Cooperation	SP II 2005 – 18

Jonathan Beck Michał Grajek Christian Wey	Hypermarket Competition and the Diffusion of Retail Checkout Barcode Scanning	SP II 2005 – 19
Ela Glowicka	Bailouts in a Common Market: A Strategic Approach	SP II 2005 – 20
Richard Deeg	Complementarity and Institutional Change: How Useful a Concept?	SP II 2005 – 21

DISCUSSION PAPERS 2006

Klaus Gugler Dennis C. Müller B. Burçin Yurtoglu	The Determinants of Merger Waves	SP II 2006 – 01
Augusto R. Micola Albert Banal Estañol Derek W. Bunn	Incentives and Cooperation in Vertically Related Energy Markets	SP II 2006 – 02
Benny Geys	Looking across Borders: A Test of Spatial Policy Interdependence using Local Government Efficiency Ratings	SP II 2006 – 03
Thomas R. Cusack	Sinking Budgets and Ballooning Prices: Recent Developments Connected to Military Spending	SP II 2006 – 04
Ela Glowicka	Effectiveness of Bailouts in the EU	SP II 2006 – 05
Benny Geys	Government Weakness and Electoral Cycles in Local Public Debt: Evidence from Flemish Municipalities	SP II 2006 – 06
Benny Geys Bruno Heyndels	Disentangling the Effects of Political Fragmentation on Voter Turnout: The Flemish Municipal Elections	SP II 2006 – 07
Johannes Münster	Selection Tournaments, Sabotage, and Participation	SP II 2006 – 08
Johannes Münster	Contests with Investment	SP II 2006 – 09
Kjell Erik Lommerud Steinar Vagstad	Mommy Tracks and Public Policy: On Self-Fulfilling Prophecies and Gender Gaps in Promotion	SP II 2006 – 10
Hilde Coffé Benny Geys	Towards an Empirical Characterization of Bridging and Bonding Social Capital	SP II 2006 – 11
Tomaso Duso Klaus Gugler Burçin Yurtoglu	How Effective is European Merger Control?	SP II 2006 – 12
Erkki Koskela Ronnie Schöb	Tax Progression under Collective Wage Bargaining and Individual Effort Determination	SP II 2006 – 13
Derek Clark Kai A. Konrad	Contests with Multi-Tasking	SP II 2006 – 14
Brian Roberson	Pork-Barrel Politics, Discriminatory Policies, and Fiscal Federalism	SP II 2006 – 15
Jonathan Beck	The Sales Effect of Word of Mouth: A Model for Creative Goods and Estimates for Novels	SP II 2006 – 16
Albert Banal-Estañol Paul Heidhues Rainer Nitsche Jo Seldeslachts	Merger Clusters during Economic Booms	SP II 2006 – 17
Susanne Prantl	The Role of Policies Supporting New Firms: An Evaluation for Germany after Reunification	SP II 2006 – 18

Tomaso Duso
Klaus Gugler
Burçin Yurtoglu

**Is the Event Study Methodology Useful for Merger
Analysis? A Comparison of Stock Market and
Accounting Data**

SP II 2006 – 19

Bei Ihren Bestellungen von WZB-Papers schicken Sie bitte unbedingt einen an Sie adressierten Aufkleber mit sowie je paper eine Briefmarke im Wert von 0,51 Euro oder einen "Coupon Reponse International " (für Besteller aus dem Ausland)

Please send a self addressed label and postage stamps in the amount of 0.51 Euro or a "Coupon-Reponse International" (if you are ordering from outside Germany) for each WZB-paper requested

Bestellschein

Order Form

Absender / Return Address:

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin
für Sozialforschung
Presse- und Informationsreferat
Reichpietschufer 50

D-10785 Berlin-Tiergarten

Hiermit bestelle ich folgende(s)
Discussion paper(s):

Please send me the following
Discussion paper(s):

Bestell-Nr. / Order no.	Autor/in, Kurztitel /Author(s) / Title(s) in brief